

**INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES**

**2006-2007 COMPLIANCE AND ON-SITE MONITORING REPORT**

**FOR:**

**Jeremi Learning**

DOCUMENT ANALYSIS		OBSERVATION		COMPLIANCE	
<b>Tutor Qualifications</b>	Unsatisfactory	<b>Lesson matches original description</b>	Unsatisfactory	<b>Criminal Background Checks</b>	In Compliance
<b>Recruiting Materials</b>	Satisfactory	<b>Instruction is clear</b>	Satisfactory	<b>Health/safety laws &amp; regulations</b>	Non-Compliance*
<b>Academic Program</b>	Satisfactory	<b>Time on task is appropriate</b>	Satisfactory	<b>Financial viability</b>	In Compliance
<b>Progress Reporting</b>	Satisfactory	<b>Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable</b>	Unsatisfactory		
		<b>Student/instructor ratio: 3:1-10:1</b>	Unsatisfactory		

**ACTION NEEDED:**

\*Although evidence was submitted to demonstrate compliance with various health & safety regulations, provider failed to submit required student release policy.

Provider submitted approved corrective action plan addressing the following:

- a. Ensuring proper training of all tutors, especially if Jeremi has contracted with an outside entity to deliver services;
- b. Ensuring that each tutor has, understands, and implements age and student academic level-appropriate lesson plans;
- c. Ensuring that tutors are trained in behavior management;
- d. Monitoring and evaluating tutor effectiveness (including but not limited to effective student engagement and behavior management), including ways in which any tutor deficiencies will be addressed (please include a copy of your tutor evaluation form);
- e. Ensuring that ONLY appropriately trained and qualified tutors deliver services.

# **On-site Monitoring Visit Rubric** **DOCUMENT ANALYSIS Components**

**NAME OF PROVIDER:** Jeremi Learning  
**REVIEWER:** MC

**DATE DOCUMENTATION RECEIVED:** (Final documentation received 4/5/07)

Providers are required to submit documentation for each component during the site visit. If documentation is not available on-site, the director or head of the provider’s organization, the site director, or another authorized representative will be required to submit documentation to the IDOE within seven (7) calendar days of site visit completion. **Failure to submit evidence could result in removal from the approved provider list.** Providers will be given an Unsatisfactory or Satisfactory for each component. Providers receiving an Unsatisfactory for any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report.

COMPONENT	DOCUMENTATION NEEDED	DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED (IDOE use only)	S	U	COMMENTS
Tutor qualifications	<b>ONE</b> of the following: -Tutor resumes/applications ( <u>all tutors</u> )  <i>In addition to:</i> <b>ONE</b> of the following: -Tutor evaluations ( <u>all tutors</u> ) -Recruiting policy for tutors ( <u>one copy</u> ) -Sample tutor contract ( <u>one copy</u> )	-Tutor resumes & applications -Sample tutor contract		X	Some tutor qualifications match the description in the provider’s application (B.A. in education and min. 3 yrs. experience). However, other resumes for persons who submitted applications to be tutors do not appear to match qualifications (e.g., application for T.H. indicates that she is a tutor & she was observed tutoring children; resume indicates that she does not have a college degree nor does she have 3 yrs. experience; application for N.H. indicates that she is a tutor but does not have a B.A. in education nor 3 yrs. experience; L.B. was observed tutoring children; her application states that she will be a “tutor assistant” but she was observed tutoring in the same capacity as other tutors; her resume indicates that she does not have a B.A. in education nor 3 years experience; tutor M.M. has a bachelor’s degree, but does not have three years of experience teaching).
Recruiting materials	<b>TWO</b> of the following:  -Advertising or recruitment fliers -Incentives policy -Program description for parents	-Recruitment flyer -Incentives information	X		Recruitment fliers match description in provider’s application. Incentives are in line with state incentive policies.
	<b>ONE</b> of the following: -Lesson plan(s) for one class in all subjects	-Lesson plans -Connections to	X		Lesson plans generally meet the description in provider application and match some of the

Academic Program	<p>offered</p> <p><i><b>In addition to:</b></i></p> <p><b>ONE</b> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Detailed lesson description</li> <li>-Specific connections to Indiana standards</li> <li>-Description of connections to curriculum of EACH district the provider works with.</li> </ul>	Indiana academic standards			observed tutoring (mostly tutoring at the second site). Lesson plans are directly derived from Indiana academic standards.
Progress Reporting	<p><b>TWO</b> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Sample progress report</li> <li>-Timeline for sending progress reports</li> <li>-Documentation of reports sent</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Individual education plan</li> <li>-Documentation of reports sent</li> </ul>		<b>X</b>	Individual education plans address standards and tell where the students are academically. Some plans/progress reports included typos and may not be easily understood by parents (i.e., generally listing standards covered and standards mastered may not be parent-friendly, as parents may not be familiar with all academic standards by number).

## On-site Monitoring Rubric OBSERVATION Components

**NAME OF PROVIDER:** Jeremi Learning

**SITE:** 1) Glenn Park Academy, Gary Community Schools

2) It Works, 1320 Broadway, Gary, IN

**TUTOR’S INITIALS (ALL TUTORS OBSERVED):** numerous tutors

**NUMBER OF LESSONS OBSERVED:** 6

**DATE:** February 27, 2007; March 8, 2007

**REVIEWER:** MC, ST, KS

**TIME OF OBSERVATION:** 4:00; 3:20

During the site visit, IDOE personnel will visit several tutoring sessions to observe lessons being provided. IDOE reviewers will be looking to see that actual tutoring matches lesson plan descriptions that are provided in requested documents, as well as those that were provided in the original provider application; that tutors and students are spending an appropriate amount of time on task; that instruction is clear and understandable; and that instructors seem knowledgeable about lesson content.

Each provider will receive a mark of “Satisfactory” (S) or “Unsatisfactory” (U) for each component. Providers receiving a “U” in any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report. Failure to address deficiencies may result in removal from the state approved list.

COMPONENT	S	U	REVIEWER COMMENTS
Lesson matches original description in provider application		<b>X</b>	At the first site, students worked in small groups in various places in the cafeteria. In one group, it was unclear what students were working on. They appeared to be completing worksheets, but the only activity observed for about 15 minutes was the tutor collecting various papers from students and students waiting to be told what to turn in next. In another group, students passed around a whiteboard and wrote letters of the alphabet on it. Students appeared bored and did not know what to do when it was not their turn. In the third group, the tutor worked on various activities. It was unclear what the actual lesson plan was, and it was unclear whether the tutor even had a lesson plan or knew what she was

			<p>supposed to be working on with the students. The activities observed at the first site did not include review, presentation of new materials, and performing understanding of the topic as described in the initial application; thus, they did not match the description provided in the original application.</p> <p>At the second site, one group of older students (5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> graders) worked on various math activities. They worked fairly independently, but the tutor helped them when they had problems with what they were working on. The tutor stopped to instruct the students in various math concepts that they might have difficulty with. In the second group, 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> grade students were working on journal writing. After they finished writing in their journals, they were asked to share what they had written aloud. The tutor and site director provided instruction and guidance as students wrote and presented. In the third group (kindergarten and 1<sup>st</sup> grade students), the tutor worked on math concepts—counting and addition, using objects drawn on the whiteboard. She reminded students of what they had already learned and asked them to answer questions and participate in group activities. A tutoring schedule that matches the description in the original application was prominently displayed in multiple places throughout the site. Tutoring observed at the second site matched the description in the original application.</p>
Instruction is clear	X		<p>At the first site, it appeared that children did not always know what they were supposed to be doing. As mentioned, children participating in the younger student group did not have anything to do as the whiteboard was being passed around. In another group, there did not appear to be any instruction, as it seemed that the whole time observation occurred, the tutor was collecting papers (the students in this group were not observed completing any work, despite 15-20 minutes of observation of this group). In the third group, the tutor moved so quickly from one unrelated concept to the next that students appeared to have difficulty keeping up.</p> <p>At the second site, in part because of the prominently displayed schedules on the wall and in part because of the strong and clear guidance of the site director and tutors, students appeared to always know what they were expected to be working on. In the older students' group, students moved from one task to the next very smoothly. In the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> grade group, students appeared to be used to their learning routine and even helped keep each other on task. The tutor and site director provided clear instructions to them, and strategies offered to them to improve their writing and speaking were clear. In the younger students' group, all students appeared to understand concepts. The tutor tried to ensure that all students comprehended what was being worked on.</p>
Time on task is appropriate	X		<p>At the first site, students had a lot of difficulty staying on task, as the atmosphere was fairly chaotic. The room was very noisy, and teachers did not appear to be able to manage students' behavior and keep the noise level down. A number of students were wandering around and appeared unsure what to do. In one group of younger children, they passed a whiteboard around and each child wrote a subsequent letter of the alphabet. Children who were waiting their turns did not have anything to do and seemed very bored and off task as they waited for the whiteboard to come back to them. The tutor did not seem knowledgeable of how to engage these students; if students got off task, they were yelled at after several minutes, but this did very little to keep them on task.</p> <p>At the second site, children were constantly on task. If a child got off task, the tutor reminded him or her to complete his or her work and follow the rules. Children seemed very engaged and interested in what they were doing. In some cases, children even kept each other on task if necessary, with the guidance of the tutor and site director. In the kindergarten room, the tutor did a very good job ensuring that students were on task and redirecting students who might have gotten off task.</p>
Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable		X	<p>At the first site, it appeared that many tutors were unaware of their students' levels and abilities. Additionally, it appeared that tutors were trying to come up with work for students to do instead of following a set lesson plan. For example, in one group, the tutor switched from writing sentences to telling time to identifying parts of a story, all within about 10 minutes. Tutors did not always appear knowledgeable about behavior management or student's academic levels. In addition, at one point the bus driver, who was waiting for students to finish so they could be taken home, approached a group of students and began tutoring them because their tutor was elsewhere in the room. It is unlikely that the bus driver met tutor qualifications as specified in Jeremi Learning's application.</p> <p>At the second site, tutors were very knowledgeable of the day's schedule and lesson plan. In the group of older children, the tutor transitioned between students and helped them as they worked on various academic assignments. The tutor provided instruction as necessary. She did not</p>

			give students the answers; instead, she tried to help them come up with answers on their own. In the group of younger children, the tutor worked with a group of children on journal writing. She provided hints and strategies about writing and reading to help the children. In the kindergarten room, the tutor provided encouragement to students and ensured that all students were able to participate and understand math concepts being taught. The site director transitioned from room to room, ensuring that tutors and students were on task. The site director was well aware of student’s academic levels and learning needs and provided some instruction as necessary.
Student/instructor ratio: <u>3:1-10:1</u>		<b>X</b>	Application notes that the ratio will be 8:1 or less. One group observed at the first site had 10 children in it, exceeding the ratio described in the original application.

**On-site Monitoring Visit Rubric**  
**COMPLIANCE Components**

**NAME OF PROVIDER:** Jeremi Learning  
**REVIEWER:** MC

**DATE DOCUMENTATION RECEIVED:** (Final documentation received 4/5/07)

The following information is rated “Compliance” (C) or “Non-Compliance” (N-C). Selected documentation listed for each component must be submitted as part of the site visit monitoring. If documentation is not available on-site, the director or head of the provider’s organization, the site director, or another authorized representative will be required to submit documentation to the IDOE within seven (7) calendar days of site visit completion. **Failure to submit evidence could result in removal from the approved provider list.**

If a provider is deemed to be in non-compliance with any component for which evidence has been requested, the provider may be contacted and may be required to develop and submit a corrective action plan for getting into compliance within 7 calendar days. If the corrective action plan is not submitted, if the corrective action plan is inappropriate or insufficient, or if the corrective action plan is not implemented, the provider may be removed from the state-approved list.

COMPONENT	REQUIRED DOCUMENTATION	DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED (IDOE USE ONLY)	C	N-C
Criminal background checks	<b>ALL</b> of the following:  -Criminal background checks from an appropriate source for every tutor and any other employees working directly with children.	-Criminal background checks were submitted and it appears were completed on every person working with the organization.	<b>X</b>	
Health and safety laws and regulations	<b>ONE</b> of the following: -Student release policy(ies)  <i>In addition to:</i> -Safety plans and/or records -Department of Health documentation of physical plant safety (if operating at a site other than a school) -Evacuation plans/policies (e.g., in case of fire, tornado, etc.) -Transportation policies (as applicable)	-Emergency response plan -Transportation plan <i>-Student release policy not submitted</i>		<b>X</b>
	<b>TWO</b> of the following:	-Business license & articles of incorporation	<b>X</b>	

Financial viability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-Notarized business license or formal documentation of legal status</li><li>-Audited financial statements</li><li>-Tax return for the past two years</li></ul>			
---------------------	--	--	--	--